



MARINE ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION  
COMMITTEE  
43rd session  
Agenda item 8

MEPC 43/8/6  
26 April 1999  
Original: ENGLISH

## REPORTS OF SUB-COMMITTEES

### Budgetary implications associated with the hazard evaluation of products in the IBC Code

#### Note by the Secretariat

#### SUMMARY

<b><i>Executive summary:</i></b>	This note summarizes the costs associated with generating new GESAMP Hazard Profiles for all products in the IBC Code and reflects the discussions of BLG 4 on this matter.
<b><i>Action to be taken:</i></b>	Paragraph 5.1
<b><i>Related documents:</i></b>	BLG 4/18, BLG 4/6/12

## 1 Introduction

1.1 At its forty-second session, the Committee noted that the new target completion date of 2002 for the review of Annex II to MARPOL 73/78 was dependent on the GESAMP Working Group on the Evaluation of the Hazards of Harmful Substances Carried by Ships (EHS) being able to re-evaluate the products in the IBC code within three years and that this could only be managed if sufficient funding would be provided to facilitate additional meetings and support. In order to decide on the budgetary implication of the re-evaluation process, MEPC 42 requested BLG 4 to provide further information.

1.2 In order to facilitate this process, the Secretariat, together with the IMO Technical Secretary of GESAMP provided BLG 4 with the following information regarding the *modus operandi* and estimation of the costs necessary for the GESAMP EHS Group to complete the task requested of it.

## 2 Structure and method of working of the EHS Group

2.1 The GESAMP EHS Working Group is a Group reporting directly to GESAMP. It evaluates the hazards of products that are pertinent to the marine environment as requested by IMO/MEPC.

2.2 In order to revise the GESAMP Hazard Profiles for the products in the IBC Code taking into account new evaluation procedures adopted by GESAMP and further the results of OECD's harmonization process, the Committee, at its forty-second session, invited the GESAMP EHS Working Group to give priority to this matter.

For reasons of economy, this document is printed in a limited number. Delegates are kindly asked to bring their copies to meetings and not to request additional copies.

2.3 As a result, the GESAMP EHS Group, at its February 1999 meeting, initiated a work programme to re-evaluate those products in the IBC Code products starting with the first 65 products listed alphabetically.

### 3 EHS Work Plan to complete the re-evaluation task by 2001

3.1 The Chairman and Secretary of the GESAMP EHS Working Group estimated that this task could be completed by 2001, subject to the availability of funds to support the necessary work to be carried out by the EHS Working Group members. However, in order to make maximum use of each EHS Working Group meeting, they recognized that data collection and preparatory meetings for sub-groups of the mammalian toxicologists, aquatic toxicologists and those assessing the environmental fate of products, would be necessary.

3.3 An outline of the preparatory work and meetings is shown below:

1999	2000	2001
±    ○ ○ ○    ±    ○ ○ ○	±    ○ ○ ○    ±    ○ ○ ○ ○	±    ○ ○ ○    ±

Where: ○ ○ ○ represents preparatory work of each of the three sub-groups for the meeting including travel to collect data and 60 days consultancy; and  
 ± represents the GESAMP EHS meeting.

3.4 From this, it can be seen that one meeting in 1999 has already taken place in 1999 during which 65 products were re-evaluated.

3.5 In consultation with the GESAMP Secretariat the costs associated with the above work plan were estimated on the basis of the following considerations whilst recognizing that these figures do not reflect the full cost of the exercise as the Working Group members time is paid for by their employees:

Resources needed	Cost
Two full EHS meetings in each year	£40,000
Six sub-group meetings in each year (two each of mammalian toxicologists, aquatic toxicologists and environmental fate specialists)	£23,400
Two trips for one member of each sub-group to gather data from the GESAMP files at IMO for evaluation in each year	£7,800
120 days EHS Group Secretarial consultancy in each year	£20,400
Additional temporary specialist assistance	£3,000
<b>Total cost</b>	<b>£94,600</b>
Resources tentatively allocated for routine work (£20,000 for one full EHS meeting plus 60 days/year consultancy in the 1999 budget and draft 2000-20001 budget)	(£30,200)
<b>Net additional cost per full year</b> (Note: 2001 will only require £38,600 as there will only be a need for one session of preparatory work which includes extra temporary specialist assistance to finalize the work)	<b>£64,400</b>

#### **4 Outcome of BLG 4**

4.1 BLG 4 noted that the suggested work method for the GESAMP EHS Working Group to finalize the task within a three-year period, i.e. 1999-2001 would require a total amount of £258,000 to be allocated. Of this figure, £30,200 is covered by the current budget for 1999 for the regular meeting of the GESAMP EHS Working Group and relevant consultancy costs. Furthermore, annual amount of £30,200 is expected to be covered by the proposed budget for the biennium 2000-2001 (C82/11) as the cost of the regular meeting of the GESAMP EHS Working Group and relevant consultancy costs. Therefore a total amount of £90,600 is assumed to be secured.. Therefore, an additional total amount of £167,400 would be needed for the work and, for this purpose, the Sub-Committee requested MEPC 43 to consider how this additional fund could be secured, either by recommending to the Council a necessary increase in the proposed budget for the next biennium or by adjusting other lower priority or importance needs in the framework of the proposed budget for the next biennium.

4.2 While recognizing that securing the necessary funds was a matter of consideration and decision by MEPC 43 and the Council at its 20th extraordinary session preceding the twenty-first Assembly, the Sub-Committee was of the opinion that finalization of the GESAMP Hazard Profiles was of paramount importance for the re-categorization of chemical substances and the revision of MARPOL Annex II and stressed that priority and resources should be given to the work of the GESAMP EHS Working Group to enable it to finalize the Hazard Profiles as soon as possible.

4.3 Although BLG 4 could not formulate concrete proposals on how the additional cost of £167,400 should be secured for the project, the following measures were suggested:

- .1 the work method suggested by the GESAMP EHS Working Group seems to be desirable, but, in order to reduce the cost to the minimum, the GESAMP EHS Working Group should be urged to find out an alternative work method by which the cost for the work could be cut as much as possible (hopefully by the one-third), while maintaining the quality of work;
- .2 GESAMP should be urged to place the highest priority on the work of the EHS Working Group and consider re-allocating the funds available for the Working Group on Endocrine Disrupting Substances to the work of the EHS Working group (£6,000 may be saved annually for the EHS Working Group totalling £18,000 in the three years);
- .3 recognizing that the agenda for BLG 5 may not comprise urgent high priority items, the BLG Sub-Committee session allocated for 2000 may be postponed and BLG 5 be held in 2001, while holding an intersessional meeting of the ESPH Working Group of the Sub-Committee in 2000. This would enable progress to be made in this group's work which would then report to BLG 5 in 2001 (£34,000 may be saved for the EHS Working Group); and
- .4 inviting Member Governments to provide financial contributions for the work of the GESAMP EHS Working Group.

The Committee is requested to take into consideration any of the measures suggested above, when discussing the matter in case the proposed budget for the next biennium cannot be increased.

4.4 With regard to the suggested cut for the cost of the work of the GESAMP EHS Working Group, the Sub-Committee noted that some members of the GESAMP EHS Working Group had expressed concern with the proposal to reduce the amount of financial resources identified to complete the work of

re-evaluating the products in the IBC Code. They assured the Sub-Committee that the EHS Group would do its best to complete this work on schedule. However, the proposed reduction in finances could result in some delay to the anticipated completion date of 2002.

## **5 Action requested of the Committee**

5.1 The Committee is invited to note the budgetary information on the re-evaluation of products in the IBC Code and consider:

- .1 whether the Council, at its 20th extraordinary session, should be requested to increase the budget for the work of GESAMP EHS Working Group for the next biennium, 2000-2001; and
  - .2 the measures suggested in paragraph 4.3 to help cover the cost for the work of the GESAMP EHS Working Group, in case the proposed budget for the next biennium cannot be increased.
-